

**CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND ENVIRONMENT  
15th November, 2010**

Present:- Councillor Smith (in the Chair); Councillors Pickering, Swift and Walker.

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Dodson.

**G66. MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CHESTERFIELD CANAL PARTNERSHIP EXECUTIVE STEERING GROUP HELD ON 10TH JUNE, 2010**

Consideration was given to the minutes of a meeting of the Chesterfield Canal Partnership Executive Steering Group held on 10<sup>th</sup> June, 2010.

Resolved:- That the contents of the minutes be noted.

**G67. OPENING OF OFFERS**

Resolved:- That the action of the Cabinet Member on 27<sup>th</sup> October, 2010 in opening offers for the former Churchfields Nursing Home, Wickersley, be recorded.

**G68. RECEIPT OF PETITION AGAINST THE PROPOSED OPENING OF THE FOOTPATH TO THE REAR OF WOODLAND CLOSE, BLUE MANS WAY, CATCLIFFE**

Consideration was given to the receipt of a petition containing 66 signatures in respect of the proposed opening up of Footpath No. 3 at Catcliffe.

Resolved:- (1) That the receipt of the petition be noted.

(2) That the Public Rights of Way Team investigates the matter raised in the petition and submits a report to a future meeting of the Cabinet Member.

(3) That the lead petitioner be informed of the action taken to date.

**G69. TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ACT 2004 - PERMITS TO WORK IN THE HIGHWAY**

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Principal Traffic Officer, explaining some of the potential changes to how works in the public highway could now be controlled, and seeking authority to investigate further the potential for a 'Permit Scheme' for work in specified streets in Rotherham by conducting a formal consultation process in accordance with Regulatory guidelines.

It was explained that one of the powers in the Traffic Management Act 2004 was the ability for local traffic authorities to apply to the Secretary of State to make an Order for a permit scheme for the control of "specified works" on all, or part, of an authority's highway network. These "specified works" were utility street works and the traffic authority's own works for highway purposes.

This would mean that Utilities had to apply to the Council for a permit and the Council could then direct when the companies would do the work. This applied to anyone working in the highway including the Council's DLO.

Of the 3 types of permit schemes available it was proposed that the Council would pursue a common permit scheme and it was reported the four South Yorkshire local authorities, together with Leeds and Kirklees, had formed a pilot and would embark on a statutory 3 months consultation on this proposal commencing in Mid December. It was pointed out that it was likely to be June/July 2011 before the scheme could be submitted to the Secretary of State and that it would be early 2012 before it could be implemented.

A cost benefit analysis for Rotherham had given a positive rate of return. Consideration had also been given to different types of work to be undertaken by a permit scheme (major, standard, minor and immediate).

It was confirmed that the scheme would give greater control over roadworks on the busiest and most important traffic routes in the Borough, reduce delays and congestion, reduce carbon emissions and improve air quality.

Resolved:- (1) That the statutory consultation for the introduction of a Permit Scheme be undertaken.

(2) That the outcome of the consultation be reported back to a future meeting of Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Environment for consideration.

#### **G70. ACCEPTANCE OF A SINGLE QUOTATION FOR A TECHNICAL AND PRODUCT INFORMATION SYSTEM**

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Principal Engineer, requesting, in accordance with Standing Orders Nos. 38.1 and 38.2, the exemption from Standing Order No 47.6.2 to enable the acceptance of a single quotation for a technical and product information system due to there being only one suitable supplier.

It was explained that technical staff needed ready access to a library of technical and product information and that paper copies and storage were expensive.

Consideration was therefore given to a website library service through subscription which could be accessed by staff whether working in the office or from home.

It was emphasised that this was a very specialised market and that there was currently only one supplier.

Resolved:- That, in accordance with Standing Orders Nos. 38.1 and 38.2, approval be given to exempt the procurement of a technical and product information system from Standing Order No. 47.6.2 and that the quotation from IHS (Global) be accepted.

**G71. A681 MOORGATE ROAD, MOORGATE - PETITION REQUESTING A CROSSING OUTSIDE ROTHERHAM HOSPITAL**

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Engineer, detailing receipt of a 187 signature petition requesting a pedestrian crossing on Moorgate Road outside Rotherham Hospital.

It was reported a pedestrian crossing assessment was undertaken in this location in 2006 and the criteria for the installation of a controlled pedestrian crossing were met. However, at that time it was decided that rather than investigate the installation of a stand alone crossing that it should be considered as part of a larger scheme to address issues such as congestion and access to the hospital by the bus service. Due to site constraints and funding issues a larger scheme was not progressed on Moorgate Road. Minor changes were however made to road markings to give more space for vehicles to queue to turn right into the Hospital, together with making Mile Oak Road a one way road.

As the original pedestrian crossing survey was done in 2006 it was recommended that a new survey be undertaken and the site be re-assessed against the Council's pedestrian crossing assessment criteria.

It was further recommended that, should the site still meet the criteria for the provision of a controlled pedestrian crossing, a feasibility study be undertaken into the practicalities of providing a stand alone crossing on Moorgate Road outside of Rotherham Hospital.

It was, however, pointed out that the provision of a stand alone crossing presented a complex problem as it may well be used by public transport users and school children and may also be used by commuters or visitors parking in the Broom Valley area and walking to the hospital.

The cost to carry out a new pedestrian crossing survey and to undertake the feasibility study into a stand alone crossing would be approximately £3,000. Funding was available for this from the South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport settlement for 2010-2011.

Members present commented that, should a crossing be required, an approach be made to the NHS suggesting that a contribution be made.

Resolved:- (1) That a new pedestrian crossing survey be undertaken and assessed using the Council's pedestrian crossing assessment criteria.

(2) That if the site meets the pedestrian crossing assessment criteria a feasibility study be undertaken into a providing a stand alone controlled pedestrian crossing on Moorgate Road outside Rotherham Hospital.

(3) That the lead petitioner be informed of this decision.

**G72. A6021 WICKERSLEY ROAD/BROOM ROAD - ACCESSIBILITY IMPROVEMENTS - OBJECTION TO EXTENSION TO EXISTING BUS LANE**

Further to Minute No. 42 of the meeting of the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Environment held on 6th September, 2010, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Engineer, detailing receipt of an objection to the proposed extension to the existing part time bus lane on the A6021 Wickersley Road approach to the Stag roundabout. [A plan showing the proposed scheme was attached to the submitted report as Appendix A.]

Reference was made to:-

- the hours of operation of the current bus lane
- the advertised Traffic Regulation Order (TRO)
- the receipt of one objection from a resident, [a copy of which was attached as Appendix B]

A summary was given of the issues raised by the objector and the Engineer provided the Service Area's response to those.

The benefit of the scheme was that it would allow the bus service to by pass more of the traffic queue on the approach to Stag roundabout which should in turn increase journey time reliability.

Reference was made to anticipated benefits to public transport passengers.

Consultation had also taken place with Statutory Consultees and Ward Members and no concerns or objections had been raised.

The cost estimate for the extension to the existing bus lane on Wickersley Road had been estimated at £44,300 (including both fees and works cost). Funding was currently available for this element of the scheme from the South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan Strategic Pot for 2010-2011.

Resolved:- (1) That the objection to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order be not acceded to and the objector be informed of this decision.

(2) That the Traffic Regulation Order be made and the scheme implemented in the 2010-11 financial year.

**G73. PROPOSED PUFFIN CROSSING, WORTLEY ROAD - REPORT OF PETITION OBJECTING TO THE PROPOSAL**

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Transportation Unit Manager, relating to the receipt of a 23 signature petition and a further 3 objections from residents affected by a proposal for a new Puffin Crossing outside St Bede's school, Wortley Road, Kimberworth.

A copy of the petition was attached and details of the objections were set out in the submitted report.

In light of the objections the Transportation Unit had re-visited the initial assessment of the crossing (undertaken in 2005) and re-assessed the location against new criteria which was approved at the 6th February, 2006 Cabinet Member for Economic, Regeneration and Development Services Meeting [Minute No. 182 refers].

The new criteria assessed the crossing location based on an average of the 4 peak hour periods of pedestrians crossing instead of the highest 2 peak periods used prior to the 2006 revision.

A simple analysis of pedestrian flows and traffic flows using the latest method identified that the proposed crossing still met the required criteria. However, closer analysis of the data showed a skew in the results. The majority of pedestrians crossing at this location crossed during two short time periods; these were at the start and end of the school day. At other times of the day the number of pedestrians crossing was low and a crossing for these low numbers would not be justified.

A School Crossing Patrol was currently in operation at the peak periods with no reported road safety or traffic related concerns. In the event that a controlled crossing was installed outside St Bede's there was the potential that the current School Crossing Patrol post would be removed.

Discussions had taken place with Children and Young People Services regarding this crossing patrol and it had been agreed that a crossing patrol was currently the best form of crossing facility at this location given there were only two times of day when there was a demand for a crossing.

As a result of the above it was therefore recommended that work on the proposal for a controlled pedestrian crossing outside properties 526 and 528 be halted and a feasibility study be undertaken to identify other potential crossing improvements.

Site observations suggested that, even though traffic islands were present nearby at the junction of Great Park Road, pedestrians were still having difficulty crossing the A629. Further improvements at the Great Park Road junction along with minor improvements around St Bede's could help to reduce vehicle speeds on the section of the A629 thereby assisting pedestrians to cross the road. It was anticipated that, with reduced funding available from the 2011/12 financial year integrated transport budget allocation, improvements at the Great Park Road junction as suggested would provide a greater benefit than a stand alone pedestrian crossing at St Bede's School.

It was pointed out that the original scheme had a budget estimate of £132,450 and would have been funded from the RMBC Local Transport Plan budget 2010/11. It was now expected that only a small proportion of this funding would be used to investigate and develop further options to improve accessibility on this section of the A629.

Also at present the level of funding for transportation projects in the 2011/12 financial year was uncertain and funding may not be available to undertake any recommended scheme.

Resolved:- (1) That no further work be undertaken on the proposal to introduce a Puffin signal controlled pedestrian crossing at this time and that further investigation be undertaken into alternatives to help pedestrians cross the road in this area.

(2) That the lead petitioner be informed of the outcome.

**G74. NORTHFIELD INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - PROPOSED NO WAITING AT ANY TIME**

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Transportation Unit Manager, relating to the receipt of three objections to proposed waiting restrictions around the Northfield Industrial Estate.

It was explained that due to on-going concerns from local businesses regarding vehicles obstructing the free and safe movement of traffic on Lincoln Street, North Drive, Field Way, Greasbrough Road Service Road and Primrose Hill at Northfield, it was proposed to introduce a series of No Waiting At Any Time restrictions. The restrictions aimed to maximise the availability of road side parking whilst maintaining access for large vehicles.

Details of the proposed scheme were illustrated on Drawing No. 126/18TT460b appended to the submitted report, together with copies of the objections.

The detailed responses from the Service Area were set out in the report.

It was explained that restrictions were also proposed on Primrose Hill and Greasbrough Road Service Road because it was anticipated that vehicles may migrate from North Drive, Lincoln Street and Field Way. The restrictions should still leave ample parking opportunities for customers and other surrounding businesses, and should not impact on access for delivery vehicles.

It was pointed out that there was currently a variety of parking options available in and around the town centre which Council staff could use.

It was confirmed that the scheme was estimated to cost £2,000 and this had been identified from the South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport settlement for 2010/11.

Resolved:- (1) That the objections to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order be not acceded to.

(2) That the objectors be informed of the above decision.

(3) That the Traffic Regulation Order be made and the waiting restrictions implemented.

**G75. PROPOSAL TO EXTEND SCHOOL KEEP CLEAR MARKINGS TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS TO ALL AREAS OF ROTHERHAM**

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Transportation Unit Manager, relating to a proposal to introduce permanent clearway orders on School Keep Clear markings, in areas of the borough where they were not already in place, on an area by area phased approach.

It was explained that a proposal to implement clearway Traffic Regulation Orders on a trial basis on all School Keep Clear markings in the Maltby Ward and on some in the Hellaby Ward was reported to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Regeneration on 21<sup>st</sup> May, 2007 (Minute No 301 refers).

The results of this trial were reported to Cabinet Member on 20<sup>th</sup> April, 2009 (Minute No. 222 refers), following which the trial was made permanent. The same report also recommended that clearway Traffic Regulation Orders be introduced on all School Keep Clear markings across the borough on an area by area phased approach starting with the Wentworth North area, and that the programme for treating the remainder be reported to a future Cabinet Member meeting.

It was reported that Clearway orders had recently been successfully introduced on School Keep Clear markings in Wentworth North and a programme for treating the remainder had now been devised as follows:-

<b>Area</b>	<b>Year</b>
Wentworth Valley and Wentworth South	2011/12
Rotherham South and Rotherham North	2012/13
Rother Valley South and Rother Valley West	2013/14

This programme had been drawn up based on the work undertaken for the joint Children and Young People and Regeneration scrutiny review into road safety outside schools which involved carrying out a risk assessment of all school entrances. Due to the amount of work and costs involved it was proposed to treat two areas per year.

It was emphasised that the enforcement of waiting restrictions was the key to their success, especially where they were known to be abused on a regular basis, such as outside schools. Therefore close co-operation between Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNTs) and the Council's Parking Services was important if clearway Traffic Regulation Orders were to be extended to other areas as this would stretch the resources of Parking Services further.

Further details in respect of enforcement were set out in the submitted report.

It was reported that it was estimated to cost £50,000 to introduce clearway Traffic Regulation Orders in the remainder of the Wentworth Valley area together with the Wentworth South area. This would be made available from the Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport Programme for 2011/12.

Each of the remaining areas would cost £30,000 to treat, with two areas, costing a total of £60,000, being treated in each of the subsequent two financial years. It was expected that funding would be made available for these areas from the respective years Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport Programme.

It was pointed out that objections to proposals for the introduction of clearway orders on School Keep Clear Markings may be forthcoming and any objections would be reported to the Cabinet Member.

The success of the scheme in dissuading parents from parking on the markings would depend on parents being informed and aware of the restrictions and the effectiveness of enforcement activity. Under the Council's decriminalised parking enforcement regime the Council's Civil Enforcement Officers had responsibility for enforcing these restrictions.

Funding for the 2011/12 Integrated Transport programme was still subject to the final settlement announcements that were expected in December 2010.

Those present referred to specific traffic issues around PFI schools sites and leisure facilities.

Resolved:- (1) That Clearway Traffic Regulation Orders be introduced on all School Keep Clear markings, in areas of the borough where they are not already in place, and these be implemented on an area by area phased approach in accordance with the programme, as detailed in the submitted report.

(2) That the next area in which clearway Traffic Regulation Orders are introduced to cover School Keep Clear markings is the remainder of the Wentworth Valley area, part of which has already been dealt with when clearway orders were introduced in the Maltby Ward and part of Hellaby Ward, and Wentworth South.

**G76. DINNINGTON ROAD / GILDINGWELLS ROAD, WOODSETTS - PROPOSED RAISED JUNCTION TABLE**

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Transportation Unit Manager, detailing the receipt of objections/concerns in relation to the proposed raised junction table at the crossroads of Dinnington Road and Gildingwells Road, Woodsetts.

It was explained that during the last 3 years a total of 5 reported Personal Injury Accidents had occurred at the junction of Dinnington Road and Gildingwells Road, Woodsetts, which in part had lead to calls from the Parish Council for measures to be introduced which reduce the danger to road users.

As a consequence, a number of traffic calming schemes for the area were produced and presented to the Parish Council in June 2010. From the schemes presented, Woodsetts Parish Council opted for a raised junction table at the crossroads.

The proposed scheme would involve the creation of a 75mm high road hump with 1.2 metre long ramps at the junction of Dinnington Road/Worksop Road/Lindrick Road and Gildingwells Road, intended to reduce vehicle speeds on all approaches to the crossroads, which should improve safety for pedestrians when crossing in the area.



Consultations on the proposals had been undertaken, involving the Emergency Services, Passenger Transport Executive, Local Ward Members, and residents / businesses close to the junction. From this consultation two objections had been received (one written, one verbal), together with three general comments/concerns, one of which was received from the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive on behalf of Stagecoach East Midlands. (These were attached as Appendix A to the submitted report).

It was explained that the general concerns raised in the correspondence received either related to the lack of additional traffic calming measures for the rest of the village, or the severity of the proposed junction table.

The Service Area's response to the point regarding the lack of additional traffic calming features for the rest of the village was that the proposed scheme was aimed primarily at addressing concerns at the crossroads.

In terms of the severity of the proposed junction table, the ramp gradients complied with the Road Hump Regulations and were in accordance with guidelines produced by the Passenger Transport Executive for road humps on bus routes. Considering that the junction table was an isolated feature and the frequency of the bus service (approximately hourly) the scheme was expected to have a minimal impact on the bus service both in terms of potential discomfort to passengers and journey time penalties.

The scheme was estimated to cost £69,450 with funding for the works coming from the Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport Programme for 2010/11. However, it was pointed out that the estimated cost was dependent upon the need to divert Statutory Undertakers' apparatus but this was expected to be minimal.

It was also pointed out that the installation of a single traffic calming feature may not completely reduce the number of reported Personal Injury Accidents taking place at this location.

Resolved:- (1) That the objections to the proposed raised junction table be not acceded to.

(2) That support for the scheme be reiterated and approval be granted for the works to be implemented.